

room has increased largely in the last ten years, and that I cannot make myself so useful in general ways in the house because of the innumerable new preparations that the physicians now employ, and the doctors demand it of a graduate nurse. In my frequent contact with the trained attendant I find physicians expect less of them, therefore they are able to make themselves more useful outside of the sickroom, and for this they receive from fifteen to twenty-one dollars per week. As they carry little responsibility, they can remain longer at a case and go almost directly to another without the much needed rest which a graduate so often finds necessary to preserve perfect health. While the demand for trained attendants is as great as it is at present the call for quick, if not perfect, training will continue. I personally do not feel I would care to advise a young friend or relative of mine to enter a large training-school, where the demands on their health and brain are so great and the training continues so long without any remuneration, whereas a bright, intelligent young girl can acquire sufficient knowledge in a few weeks or months to make her a fair wage-earner at once. I do not approve of the conditions and am sure that the long, careful training gives best results to patient, physician, and nurse. But what are we to do if, when we leave the training-school, after three years of hard work and great self-sacrifice, we find our field filled by young women who have acquired a slight, superficial knowledge of our work by correspondence or otherwise? Our own school physicians recommend them as being "just as good as a graduate nurse, more obliging and cheaper," yet these same physicians have lectured to us and given us clinical instruction. Is their training deficient, or are the training-schools in fault? Do let us find out, and get at the root of this matter. I consider the "questionable school" only a "branch."

A GRADUATE OF THE ORANGE (N. J.) TRAINING-SCHOOL.

---

DEAR EDITOR: I would like to refer to the letter from your correspondent, L. J. P., in which she quotes a "prominent New England surgeon." Let us hope that his words were jocosely meant when he spoke of "labor unions." If not, I will not pretend to decide what he ought to know, but would like to say that I earnestly wish all nurses would try to gain a little rational and sympathetic (that means understanding) knowledge of labor unions. All students of social movements, such as Miss Jane Addams, for instance, agree that the labor union has been and is, in spite of imperfections and human frailties, one of the most potent and valuable agencies in the gradual uplifting of working populations. It is by no means only a means of raising

wages (though that is legitimate enough, for decent wages make the difference between man and slave), it is also a training in practical brotherhood, and with such results as the world does not see elsewhere to-day except in small groups of choice spirits.

We *want* to cultivate this feeling in our sisterhood. We *want* nurses to realize, as the union workingman does, that the concern of one is the concern of all. What helps one, helps all. What degrades one, degrades all. It is only necessary to recall how labor unions are regarded in Russia to know how to estimate them.

Let us beware of mental "spooks" or "bogeys." In Italy, in certain circles, one can hear it said that so-and-so is a "Free Mason," and one might really imagine that that meant devil with horns and tail, so abhorrent is the idea contained in those simple words. This current way of speaking of labor unions seems to me a similar "spook." Then about the wages: I can't bear to think of nurses as mercenary, yet I must smile over the news I had the other day of an acquaintance who spent a couple of months in the private hospital of a "prominent surgeon" at an expense of *nearly* ten thousand dollars! Two special nurses at twenty-five dollars a week make little difference in this sum.

Then about the hours: Where the nurses' unions are only in early stages private-duty hours are no worse here than at home, but hospital hours, arranged by medical directors and hospital superintendents, range anywhere from fifteen to eighteen, with two weeks' vacation in the year.

The notion that overwork is meritorious and desirable is another "spook."

I do sincerely hope that New England nurses (since they especially seem to be getting reactionary advice) will think twice before they are led out of their free, self-governing associations into difficulties and entanglements such as European nurses are straining every nerve to get away from.

L. L. DOCK.

---

DEAR EDITOR: I regret to say that I expressed myself in such a way that the Superintendent of the Army Nurse Corps misunderstood my real meaning. I did not in the least intend to reflect on the personality or character of the nurses employed to-day. Having myself been engaged in the work at Fortress Monroe during the Spanish-American War, and also in the Philippines, I spoke from my own experience.

Nursing any man, whether soldier or civilian, is not demoralizing. In the case of the army nurse in time of peace, it is her environment to which I refer.

As a rule, she who enters army work lays aside her ambition and accepts a small pecuniary return for the sake of the freedom it offers.